

Obligations of above agencies for water research

Department:	[In millions of dollars]	1969 estimate
Agriculture	-----	\$21
Defense	-----	8
Health, Education, and Welfare	-----	2
Interior	-----	104
Atomic Energy Commission	-----	3
National Science Foundation	-----	2
Other	-----	3
Total	-----	143

NOTE.—The total Federal expenditure for research and development is \$16,000,000,000 for 1969. Of this, \$143 million is allocated for water research, only one portion of which is spent on water pollution research.

In the recent publication, "Water Pollution Control 1969-73—The Federal Costs," there is identified a total of only 58 million dollars for the research effort in 1969. FWPCA has planned expenditures in 1968 for eutrophication control amounting to 5.5 million dollars. These figures are striking when compared to amounts spent on other programs especially when we consider the publicity given to the needs and the unknowns of pollution control technology. The small part of our space effort, the Surveyor Program, was to land only seven instrument packages of the moon, yet this cost 350 million dollars—more than the annual budget for our total pollution control efforts.

If we are to make any sense of the figures above, we must have a breakdown of the program on how these funds are to be spent, so that a reordering of priorities can be made. By merely looking at the magnitude of the figures for each agency, it is obvious by any measurement that little emphasis is being put into pollution control research. An argument that present expenditures are the maximum possible at this time is hard to defend, considering the greater costs of waiting. The bill that I have proposed is not the total dollar answer, but in view of the Vietnam war it offers a reasonable alternative for fiscal year 1969.

H.R. 13312 gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to initiate research and demonstration programs of new or improved methods for preventing, removing, and controlling pollution of the nation's lakes whether caused by natural or artificial processes. It is essential that we make this beginning. Present knowledge of eutrophication and the techniques for lake reclamation is too limited, and our financial resources are too limited, to begin on a full scale a program of federal involvement. But there must be federal support for research efforts across the nation to insure a more coordinated attack on the problem and to insure that the necessary level of effort is applied. This will mean that funds allotted for treatment facilities will go toward effective long-range plans for accomplishing the job, not to plants already out-of-date for today's waste problems.

If we are to identify the answers to algae blooms in eutrophic lakes, we must have an interdisciplinary approach to pollution. The complexity of the condition requires knowledge from diverse fields of research.

Preventing America's lakes from dying appeals to all of us. It combines the conservation of economic values, public health, prudent husbanding of natural resources, protection of wild life, restoration and preservation of natural beauty, the recapture of recreational and sport opportunities, and a decent regard for cleanliness. But what is the cost? The real cost is measured not only in physical facilities such as waste control plants, but in decreasing use of water, fewer jobs, and deferred production.

It is not possible to restore all bodies of water to their virgin condition. Today the state of the art of cleaning up the nation's water is such that we have few alternatives. Research must give us new alternatives. If the cost for clean water over the next five years is 26 billion dollars, as estimated by the FWPCA, then it is obvious—regardless of the qualification on this amount—we need a better technological base from which to accomplish the job efficiently.

There has been a breath of fresh air in government, with the recent advent of cost/effectiveness techniques. The application of the PPB system to a tangible, quantitative assurance that projects are selected on their merits and pursued at the most economical rate. Without this assurance, I would not recommend action. The kind of program I envision is one that halts this irreversible degradation of our lakes in its tracks, that proceeds vigorously, promptly, comprehen-